UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,844	09/27/2000	Geoffrey D. Alexander	RSW9-2000-0068-US1	5858

7590 01/14/2005

Jeanine S Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corp Dept T81 Bldg 503
P.O.Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
BRANCOLINI, JOHN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/670,844	ALEXANDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R Brancolini	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-61* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57 and 59-61* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *58* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 September 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-61 are pending in the application.

This action in response to Request for Continued Examination filed October 20, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejection to claim 61 is withdrawn due to amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11-14, 19-23, 26-28, 30, 32-34, 36-39, 41-42, 45, 47-49, 51-55, 57, 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US Patent Number 6380959), hereinafter referred to as Wang, in view of Scully et al. (US Patent Number 4807154), hereinafter referred to as Scully, further in view of Russell Borland "Running Microsoft Outlook 97", hereinafter referred to as Borland.

In regards to claim 1, Wang discloses a computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media, the computer program product adapted for providing an electronic calendar-driven application and comprising:

- Computer-readable program code means for creating calendar events on an electronic calendar, the calendar events being organized according to a multi-level hierarchy comprising context events at an upper level of the hierarchy, and specific events at a lower level of the hierarchy (Fig 1 shows a hierarchal calendar containing multiple levels, such as monthly, daily and yearly views), wherein zero or more specific events may be scheduled on the electronic calendar during any particular context event (Fig 8 shows a view of the calendar at the highest hierarchal level, where one can see that zero or more specific events are scheduled for each context event).

Wang however lacks the computer-readable code means for interrogating the calendar to provide information about a user.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability (col 3 lines 39-58) in order to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability as taught by Scully to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event.

This combination of Wang in view of Scully, however, fails to teach time-independent events and thus requires another reference. Borland discloses that Outlook 97 comes with a feature called Out of Office Assistant, which allows a user to set a time-independent event which automatically replies to messages sent. This is shown as being useful as it allows a user an open-ended period of time in which the

system will automatically respond to incoming messages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Wang in view of Scully to include time-independent events as taught by Borland to allow a user to have an open-ended period of time in which the system will automatically respond to incoming messages.

In regards to claim 2, Wang discloses computer readable program code adapted for automatically applying a default context during calendar periods when no other context event is active (col 4 lines 54-57, the computer automatically assigns default parameters).

In regards to claim 3, the shown combination of Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming email. Borland however, teaches that an incoming email can be automatically detected and a reply automatically sent to the original sender if the user has something scheduled on their calendar at that time (page 44) to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include automatic email detection and reply as taught by Borland to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available.

In regards to claim 4, Borland shows that the automatic response can be altered by the user as they see fit to include information about when they are next available (page 44).

In regards to claim 9, Wang discloses:

- Computer-readable program code adapted for receiving a request for project management information (col 13 lines 62-67).
- Wherein the computer-readable program code adapted for interrogating interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users at a target date and a target time period (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code adapted for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 11, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events (col 4 lines 50-57).

In regards to claim 12, Scully, as also shown in the discussion of claim 1, discloses the computer-readable program code means for interrogating further comprises computer-readable program code means for interrogating the specified attributes of a context event and of any specific event that are applicable to a target date and a target time or target time period (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific time and date can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 13, the shown combination of Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming email. Borland however, teaches that an incoming email can be automatically detected and a reply automatically sent to the original sender if the user has something scheduled on their calendar at that time (page 44) to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include automatic email detection and reply as taught by Borland to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available.

In regards to claim 14, Wang discloses overrides may be specified for the attribute values and wherein the computer-readable program code means for interrogating further comprises computer-readable program code means for applying the overrides to the attribute values (the user can override the default response, page 44).

In regards to claim 19, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events and further comprising:

- Computer-readable program code means for receiving a request for project management information for a target date and a target time period (col 13 lines 62-67).
- Wherein the computer-readable program code means for interrogating interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users at the target date and the target time period, the specified attributes of scheduled context events, and the specified attributes of any scheduled specific events (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are

available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 20, Wang discloses overrides may be specified for the attribute values and wherein the computer-readable program code means for interrogating further comprises applying the overrides to the attribute values (the calendar can be set to automatically trigger an action based on a certain event, col 4 lines 50-57).

In regards to claim 21, Wang discloses default attribute values may be specified for context event types and for specific event types, and wherein a particular context event and/or a particular specific event may include attribute values which override the default attribute values (a user may select any Action to occur for an event, thereby overriding the default, col 4 lines 49-57, Fig 4).

In regards to claim 22, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how to automatically contact the user (page 44).

In regards to claim 23, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how often the user checks electronic mail messages (page 44).

In regards to claim 26, Wang discloses a system for providing an electronic calendar-driven application, comprising:

- Means for creating calendar events on an electronic calendar, the calendar events being organized according to a multi-level hierarchy comprising context events at an upper level of the hierarchy and specific events at a lower level of the hierarchy (Fig 1 shows a hierarchal calendar), wherein zero or more specific events may be scheduled on the electronic calendar during any particular context event (Fig 8 shows a view of the calendar at the highest hierarchal level, where one can see that zero or more specific events are scheduled for each context event).

Wang however lacks the computer-readable code means for interrogating the calendar to provide information about a user.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability (col 3 lines 39-58) in order to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability as taught by Scully to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event.

This combination of Wang in view of Scully, however, fails to teach time-independent events and thus requires another reference. Borland discloses that Outlook 97 comes with a feature called Out of Office Assistant, which allows a user to set a time-independent event which automatically replies to messages sent. This is shown as being useful as it allows a user an open-ended period of time in which the system will automatically respond to incoming messages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Wang in view of Scully to include time-independent events as taught by Borland to allow a user to have an open-ended period of time in which the system will automatically respond to incoming messages.

In regards to claim 27, Wang discloses means for automatically applying a default context during calendar periods when no other context event is active (col 4 lines 54-57, the computer automatically assigns default parameters).

In regards to claim 28, the shown combination of Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 26 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming email. Borland however, teaches that an incoming email can be automatically detected and a reply automatically sent to the original sender if the user has something scheduled on their calendar at that time (page 44) to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include automatic email detection and reply as taught by Borland to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available.

In regards to claim 30, Wang discloses:

- Means for receiving a request for project management information (col 13 lines 62-67).
- Wherein the means for interrogating interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users at a target date and a target time period (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 32, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events (col 4 lines 50-57).

In regards to claim 33, Scully, as shown in the discussion of claim 26, discloses means for interrogating further comprises means for interrogating the specified attributes of a context event and of any specific event that are applicable to a target date and a target time or target time period (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific time and date can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 34, the shown combination of Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 26 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming email. Borland however, teaches that an incoming email can be automatically detected and a reply automatically sent to the original sender if the user has something scheduled on their calendar at that time (page 44) to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include automatic email detection and reply as taught by Borland to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available.

In regards to claim 36, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events and further comprising:

- Means for receiving a request for project management information for a target date and a target time period (col 13 lines 62-67).
- Wherein the means for interrogating interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users at the target date and the target time period, the specified attributes of currently-applicable context events, and the specified attributes of any currently-applicable specific events (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 37, Wang discloses default attribute values may be specified for context event types and for specific event types, and wherein a particular context event and/or a particular specific event may include attribute values which override the default attribute values (a user may select any Action to occur for an event, thereby overriding the default, col 4 lines 49-57, Fig 4).

In regards to claim 38, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how to automatically contact the user (page 44).

In regards to claim 39, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how often the user checks electronic mail messages (page 44).

In regards to claim 41, Wang discloses a method for providing an electronic calendar-driven application, comprising the steps of:

- Creating calendar events on an electronic calendar, the calendar events being organized according to a multi-level hierarchy comprising context events at an upper level of the hierarchy and specific events at a lower level of the hierarchy (Fig 1 shows a hierarchal calendar), wherein zero or more specific events may be scheduled on the electronic calendar during any particular context event (Fig 8 shows a view of the calendar at the highest hierarchal level, where one can see that zero or more specific events are scheduled for each context event).

Wang however lacks the computer-readable code means for interrogating the calendar to provide information about a user.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability (col 3 lines 39-58) in order to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include interrogating the calendar program for a user's availability as taught by Scully to minimize the time and effort required to reply to requests for participation in an event.

This combination of Wang in view of Scully, however, fails to teach time-independent events and thus requires another reference. Borland discloses that Outlook 97 comes with a feature called Out of Office Assistant, which allows a user to set a time-independent event which automatically replies to messages sent. This is shown as being useful as it allows a user an open-ended period of time in which the system will automatically respond to incoming messages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Wang in view of Scully to include time-independent events as taught by Borland to allow a user to have an open-ended period of time in which the system will automatically respond to incoming messages.

In regards to claim 42, Wang discloses the step of automatically applying a default context during calendar periods when no other context event is active (col 4 lines 54-57, the computer automatically assigns default parameters).

In regards to claim 45, Wang discloses:

- Receiving a request for project management information (col 13 lines 62-67).
- Wherein the interrogating step interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users at a target date and a target time period (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 47, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events (col 4 lines 50-57).

In regards to claim 48, Scully, as shown in the discussion of claim 41, discloses the interrogating step further comprises interrogating the specified attributes of a context event and of any specific event that are applicable to a target date and a target time or - target time period (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific time and date can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 49, the shown combination of Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 41 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming email. Borland however, teaches that an incoming email can be automatically detected and a reply automatically sent to the original sender if the user has something scheduled on their calendar at that time (page 44) to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include automatic email detection and reply as taught by Borland to allow the user to automatically notify the original sender of an email that they are not available.

In regards to claim 51, Wang discloses zero or more attribute values may be specified for each of the context events and each of the specific events and further comprising the step of:

- Receiving a request for project management information for a target date and a target time period (col 13 lines 62-67).

- Wherein the interrogating step interrogates the calendar events created for a plurality of users at the target date and the target time period to provide information about the context events and specific events scheduled for the users, the specified attributes of currently-applicable context events, and the specified attributes of any currently-applicable specific events (col 6 lines 4-11).

Wang, however, fails to disclose program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information.

Scully, however, discloses the limitation of automatically generating a response (col 3 lines 55-62) to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang to include program code means for generating a response informing the requester of project management information as taught by Scully to allow a meeting scheduler to quickly determine if all users are available to supply project management information.

In regards to claim 52, Wang discloses default attribute values may be specified for context event types and for specific event types, and wherein a particular context event and/or a particular specific event may include attribute values which override the default attribute values (a user may select any Action to occur for an event, thereby overriding the default, col 4 lines 49-57, Fig 4).

In regards to claim 53, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how to automatically contact the user (page 44).

In regards to claim 54, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as an alternative contact person for the user (page 44).

In regards to claim 55, Borland teaches that the automatic response can be altered to include information such as how often the user checks electronic mail messages (page 44).

In regards to claim 57, Scully, as shown in the discussion of claim 41, discloses the interrogating step further comprises interrogating a specific event that is applicable to a target date and a target time or target time period (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific time and date can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 59, Scully, as shown in the discussion of claim 41, discloses the interrogating step further comprises interrogating a specific event for the user (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific time, or lower level specific event, can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 60, Scully discloses the interrogating step further comprises interrogating a context event for the user (col 3 lines 39-58, Scully shows that a specific day, or upper level context event can be examined by the interrogating program).

In regards to claim 61, Scully discloses the interrogating step further comprises the step of analyzing selected ones of the attribute values for the user (an attribute value, such as availability for a selected time slot is interrogated by the system in Scully, col 3 lines 38-41).

Claims 5-6, 15-16, 24, 43, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland as applied to claims 1-4, 9, 11-14, 19-23, 26-28, 30, 32-34, 36-39, 41-42, 45, 47-49, 51-55, 57, 59-61 above, and in further view of Olivier (US Patent Number 6480885).

In regards to claim 5, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming instant message. Olivier, however, teachers the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message informing the sender of the user's current status (col 23 line 66 – col 24 lines 4) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message

informing the sender of the user's current status as taught by Olivier to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status.

In regards to claim 6, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland shows a system with an automated response to an inquiry (see claim 1 discussion). Using the teaching of Olivier shown above in claim 5's discussion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang in view of Scully to send information in the automated response about when the user is next available for instant messaging.

In regards to claim 15, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming instant message. Olivier, however, teachers the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message informing the sender of the user's current status (col 23 line 66 – col 24 lines 4) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message informing the sender of the user's current status as taught by Olivier to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status.

In regards to claim 16, Wang discloses overrides may be specified for the attribute values and wherein the computer-readable program code means for

interrogating further comprises applying the overrides to the attribute values (a user may select any Action to occur for an event, thereby overriding the default, col 4 lines 49-57, Fig 4).

In regards to claim 24, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland shows a system with an automated response to an inquiry (see claim 15 discussion). Using the teaching of Olivier shown above in claim 5's discussion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang in view of Scully to send information in the automated response about when the user is next available for instant messaging.

In regards to claim 43, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 41 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming instant message. Olivier, however, teachers the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message informing the sender of the user's current status (col 23 line 66 – col 24 lines 4) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming instant message and response to the message informing the sender of the user's current status as taught by Olivier to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the sender of their status.

Claims 7-8, 17-18, 25, 29, 35, 40, 44, 50, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Scully as applied to claims 1-2, 9, 11-12, 1-4, 9, 11-14, 19-23, 26-28, 30, 32-34, 36-39, 41-42, 45, 47-49, 51-55, 57, 59-61 above, and in further view of Epstein et al. (US Patent Number 6327343), hereinafter referred to as Epstein.

In regards to claim 7, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 8, Epstein shows that the message can be directed to a voice mail system where the user can record an automated response message including information such as when the user is next available (the system can respond with a sent message to the caller, col 3 lines 52-67)

In regards to claim 17, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 1 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 18, Wang discloses overrides may be specified for the attribute values and wherein the computer-readable program code means for interrogating further comprises applying the overrides to the attribute values (a user may select any Action to occur for an event, thereby overriding the default, col 4 lines 49-57, Fig 4).

In regards to claim 25, Epstein shows that the message can be directed to a voice mail system where the user can record an automated response message including information such as how often the user checks voice mail messages (the system can respond with a sent message to the caller, col 3 lines 52-67).

In regards to claim 29, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 26 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 35, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 26 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 40, Epstein shows that the message can be directed to a voice mail system where the user can record an automated response message including information such as how often the user checks voice mail messages (the system can respond with a sent message to the caller, col 3 lines 52-67).

In regards to claim 44, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 41 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 50, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland disclose all limitations of the claim (see discussion of claim 41 above), with the exception of detecting an incoming voice call. Epstein, however, teachers the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status (Fig 1 item 18, col 3 lines 52-61) to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to modify Wang in view of Scully to include the detection of an incoming voice call and response to the call informing the caller of the user's current status as taught by Epstein to allow a user to automatically and instantly update the caller of their status.

In regards to claim 56, Epstein shows that the message can be directed to a voice mail system where the user can record an automated response message including information such as how often the user checks voice mail messages (the system can respond with a sent message to the caller, col 3 lines 52-67).

Claims 10, 31, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland as applied to claim 1-2, 9, 11-12, 1-4, 9, 11-14, 19-23, 26-28, 30, 32-34, 36-39, 41-42, 45, 47-49, 51-55, 57, 59-61 above, and further in view of King et al. (US Patent Number 5528745), hereinafter referred to as King.

In regards to claim 10, 31 and 46, Wang in view of Scully, in further view of Borland fail to disclose wherein the request asks whether any team member is available at a particular location during a particular time period on a particular date. King, however, teaches inquiring whether any team member is available at a particular location during a particular time period on a particular date (col 3 lines 52-65) to allow a meeting scheduler to see if all attendees are available. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang in view of Scully to include inquiring whether any team member is available at a particular location during a particular time period on a particular date as taught by King to allow a meeting scheduler to see if all attendees are available.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 58 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John R Brancolini whose telephone number is (571) 272-3948. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JRB

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100